



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,371	06/13/2001	Zhong-Min Wei	21829/91 (EBC-007)	4973

7590

09/16/2002

Michael L. Goldman  
NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Clinton Square  
P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, NY 14603

EXAMINER

KUBELIK, ANNE R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1638

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application N .

09/880,371

Applicant(s)

WEI ET AL.

Examiner

Anne R. Kubelik

Art Unit

1638

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne R. Kubelik.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Edwin Merkel.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_ .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant pointed out that the Non-responsive mailed 5 September 2002, was sent in error because Applicant DID elect both a group and a species of bacteria in the first paragraph of the Response to the Restriction Requirement filed 26 July, 2002. Examiner agrees and the Non-responsive is withdrawn. .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required